

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-10 and 12-33 were previously pending in the present application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1-10 and 12-33 were rejected. The Applicants amend Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 25-26 herein. Additionally, the Applicants add Claims 34-45.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Within the Office Action, Claim 26 was objected to due to an informality. The Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out the defect. Accordingly, the Applicants currently amend Claim 26 to cure the cited ambiguity.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi in view of Kusuda

Also within the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 11-12, and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2004/0078424 to Yairi et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Yairi”) in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0088623 to Kusuda “hereinafter referred to as “Kusuda”).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi nor Kusuda, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claims 1-4, 11-12, or 25-28.

Specifically neither Yairi nor Kusuda teach or suggest “[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window.” These limitations are taught

throughout the specification, for example on Page 21, Line 3 through Page 24, Line 17.

Indeed, these limitations are substantial because as explained in the originally filed disclosure, existing translation solutions for instant messaging participants who speak a different language must each "load the third-party service application into the users' computers." Page 6, Lines 14-25. The participants must separately: load text from the instant message screen into the third-party service, translate the text, and transfer the translated text back to the instant messaging application. The Applicants' claimed invention avoids this multi-step process by evoking "application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window." However, a hypothetical combination of Yairi and Kusuda does not teach or suggest these features.

Yairi involves methods for allowing mobile devices access to a web-based instant messaging network. Paragraphs [0023], [0039]. The Yairi web service broker 105 interprets commands from the relatively simple mobile environment, transforms that into a form suitable for the more complex web environment, detects and retrieves information from the more complex web environment, and then delivers that retrieved information in a form suitable for the mobile device. Paragraphs [0025] through [0032].

However, Yairi does not teach or suggest "[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window." In fact, the Examiner admits on Page 4 of the Office Action that Yairi fails to teach or suggest running an external application with an application agent for display on a screen. Furthermore, Yairi

clearly does not involve a "translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window."

Furthermore, teach or suggest "[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window." Kusuda is directed to providing an ancillary communication channel, specifically a "chat" for enabling two users to independently view a common document such as a web page or other information, then to establish a communication channel that is represented by a computer screen window in which one user can type and another user can view that communication. Paragraphs [0031] through [0051]. However, Kusuda does not involve translation services generally, nor does it involve application agents for sharing external translation application between users of an instant messaging application. In fact, the Examiner does not allege that Kusuda teach "[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window."

As explained above, neither Yairi nor Kusuda teach or suggest "[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window." On the other hand, Claims 1 and 25 contain this limitation explicitly and Claims 2, 4-10, 12-24, 26, and 28-33 contain the limitation by reference. For at least these reasons, Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-26, and 28-33 are allowable over a hypothetical combination of Yairi and Kusuda.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Kusuda in view of McMullin

Also within the Office Action, Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, in view of Kusuda, further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2004/0125924 to McMullin et al. (hereinafter referred to as “McMullin”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor McMullin either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 5.

Specifically neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor McMullin teach or suggest “[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window.” McMullin involves providing call destination information to a phone caller. However, McMullin has nothing to do with application agents for providing external applications to an instant messaging service, or with translation services.

On the other hand, Claim 5 contains this limitation by reference to Claim 1. For at least this reasons, Claims 5 is allowable over a hypothetical combination of Yairi, Kusuda, and McMullin.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Kusuda in view of Bjoernsen

Also within the Office Action, Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, in view of Kusuda, further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2004/0174392 to Bjoersen et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Bjoernsen”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor Bjoernsen either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 6.

Specifically neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor Bjoernsen teach or suggest “[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window.” Bjoernsen involves collaborative computer services provided between multiple users of a computer system. However, Bjoernsen is silent about translation services.

On the other hand, Claim 6 contains this limitation by reference to Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claims 6 is allowable over a hypothetical combination of Yairi, Kusuda, and Bjoernsen.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoernsen in view of Dickerman

Also within the Office Action, Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoersen, further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0177184 to Dickerman et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Dickerman”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoernsen, nor Dickerman either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 7.

Specifically neither Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoernsen, nor Dickerman teach or suggest “[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window.” Dickerman involves a peer-to-peer communications system.

Dickerman also involves sharing applications between users of said network. However, Dickerman is silent about translation services.

On the other hand, Claim 7 contains this limitation by reference to Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claims 7 is allowable over a hypothetical combination of Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoernsen, and Dickerman.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Kusuda, in view of Pennock

Also within the Office Action, Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, Kusuda, further in view of United States Patent No. 6,807,562 to Pennock et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Pennock"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor Pennock either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 13.

Specifically neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor Pennock teach or suggest "[a] system for providing real-time communication over a global network in a session between two or more users ... comprising ... application agents, associated to a translation service application... said translation service application capable of translating content as it is typed into said message entry window."

Pennock involves an apparatus and associated network for selecting a voice chat session over said network. However, Pennock is silent about translation services.

On the other hand, Claim 13 contains this limitation by reference to Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claims 13 is allowable over a hypothetical combination of Yairi, Kusuda, and Pennock.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Pennock, in view of Bjoersen

Also within the Office Action, Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, Pennock, further in view of Bjoersen. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Pennock, nor Bjoersen either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 1, as explained above. Therefore Claim 21 is allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Kusuda, in view of Dickerman

Also within the Office Action, Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, Kusuda, further in view of Dickerman. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor Dickerman either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 23, as explained above. Therefore Claim 23 is allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Kusuda, in view of Bjoernsen

Also within the Office Action, Claims 31 and 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, Kusuda, further in view of Bjoernsen. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Kusuda, nor Bjoernsen either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 25. Therefore Claims 31 and 33 are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoernsen in view of Dickerman

Also within the Office Action, Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoernsen further in view of Dickerman. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because neither Yairi, Kusuda, Bjoernsen, nor Dickerman, either alone or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of Claim 25. Therefore Claims 32 is allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims have been distinguished from the art of record, and that all objections and rejections to the Claims have been overcome. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request allowance. Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact the Applicants' attorney, at (650) 474-8400.

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn at 650-474-8400.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862